

CCR Education Sub-Workgroup

October 24, 2016, 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Notes

• **Purpose:** To discuss how the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) system interplays with Child Welfare and the Mental Health systems in the integration and implementation of CCR.

| AGENDA ITEM | NOTES/DISCUSSION | ACTION ITEMS |
|--|--|--------------|
| I. | Participants: (in-person and via phone) | |
| Welcome and Introductions | Breaking Barriers: Maureen Burness, Elizabeth Estes; | |
| Stuart Oppenheim, Child and Family | • CA Dept. of Education: Elizabeth Dearstyne, Ranzo Bernales, Halena Le, Peter | |
| Policy Institute of California (CFPIC) | Foggiato; | |
| | CBHDA: Kim Suderman; | |
| | CDSS/DHCS Shared Management: Richard Knecht; | |
| | CDSS: Ahmed Nemr, John Sanfilippo, Loretta Miller, Lupe Grimaldi, Rami | |
| | Chand, Rebecca Buchmiller, Theresa Thurmond, Tracy Urban, Alma Lopez; | |
| | CFPIC: Stuart Oppenheim; | |
| | Los Angeles DCFS: Patricia Armani, | |
| | Madera County Human Services: Danny Morris; | |
| | • County MH, LA: Robert Byrd; | |
| | CWDA: Jennie Pettet; | |
| | Dept. of Employment & Social Ser., Butte Co.: Shelby Boston; | |
| | Health & Human Services Agency, SD: Melinda Verbon; | |
| | • Probation Sacramento: Melissa Jacobs; | |
| | • SELPA: Karen Coleman, Sam Neustadt, Anjanette Pelletier, Caryn Moore, Julie | |
| | Lenhardt, Angela McNeece, Barbara Bloom, Conde Kunzman, Elizabeth | |

| AGENDA ITEM | NOTES/DISCUSSION | ACTION ITEMS |
|--------------------------|--|--------------|
| | Engelken, Tamara Clay, Mindy Fattig, Tracy Schroeder, Jovan Jacobs, Benay | |
| | Loftus, Veronica Coates, Jodi Couick. | |
| II. | This item was rescheduled to the following meeting. | |
| CCR Updates | | |
| Sara Rogers, CDSS | | |
| III. | CDSS | |
| Funding Structures | Title IV-E Funds: | |
| John Sanfilippo, CDSS | Board and Care Rate-currently age based | |
| Peter Foggiato, CDE | Care and supervision of child | |
| Elizabeth Dearstyne, CDE | Administrative services (social worker doing case management activities) | |
| | Feds pay 50%/state or county match other 50% | |
| | No cap | |
| | Current RCL- | |
| | Three components to the rate: | |
| | Child care and supervision | |
| | Social worker activities | |
| | MH treatment services | |
| | 90% capacity rate must be maintained | |
| | Certified GH administrator (will continue in CCR) | |
| | New Rate Structure | |
| | Single rate for STRTP | |
| | Age no longer factor | |
| | Resource Family Rate structure based on Level of Care(LOC) and, for FFA's, | |
| | supervision by FFA staff | |
| | LOC rates will be paid to all Resource Families whether they are approved by County or FFA | |
| | Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) will still have the same rate, but | |
| | will be called something else | |
| | New Services-only rate will be available | |
| | 14CW SCIVICES-OTHY Tate WIII DE AVAIIADIE | |

| AGENDA ITEM | NOTES/DISCUSSION | ACTION ITEMS |
|-------------|--|--|
| | LOC Protocol-key domains: physical, health, education, behavioral/emotional, family relations/permanency Education Capacity concerns-education (foster/resource families and availability of residential placements when education is placing agency) Need for residential placements not accounted for in AB403 Categorical funding model for Special Education reviewed There is a main funding stream based on Average Daily Attendance All SELPAs are doing their work differently Out of home care in Education is calculated using the RCL system Foster youth one small piece of SELPA population Funding determined by bed count capacity Discussion Data match across Departments (if everyone has a different criteria for measuring, how will we be able to demonstrate success to the Legislature) How to fund GH during transition or during extension? Will there be any students that will remain in the GH setting and are exempt from CCR? Yes- regional center and DDS placements Licensing for GH not making the transition to STRTP and can be sustained by other type of fund that not title IV-E: Are they going to be licensed? What will they be called? Is it going to be a standalone category? Can CCL be invited to the net meeting to address those concerns? What is the funding status after January 1, 2017 for those placements that has no extension or not going to covert to STRTP? As more children transition from GH to foster homes, SELPA funding will decrease even though needs do not. Should foster rates be increased? | - Invite CCL to address the placements related concerns in the next in meeting on November 30, 2016. |

| AGENDA ITEM | NOTES/DISCUSSION | ACTION ITEMS |
|--|--|---|
| IV. | Current rate based on RCL structure, when that is gone; could rate be put in statute? AB403 created a new set of processes for foster youth, but this leaves out other populations of youth who utilize GH settings. AB 114 restricts the use of funds to only students who have an IEP and have a Mental Health related service included in their IEP. AB 114 highlighted the need to understand how LEAs could become approved MH providers under the county mental health plan or under the county managed care plan – especially for youth who need MH services to benefit from special ed. As the number of GH is going to decrease, what is the expectation of the GH number in four years? What is the status of the regional centers children as they are mostly long-term residents at their placements? | - Form a small |
| Enhancing Collaboration Between IEP and CFT Processes Lupe Grimaldi, CDSS Benay Loftus | Educations role at CFT is it defined as a requirement or is it recommended as a best practice? Scheduling conflict for education folks to attend Conversation needed regarding how to include education on a more consistent basis Shared consideration of least restrictive environments although means slightly different thing for CW vs. Education Confidentiality of sharing students' information requires informed consent from the holder of educational rights of the youth. Not every child has IEP, but every foster child has to have a CFT, this creates a need for both general education and special education to be informed of and involved in CFT's. Some foster youth are not in placement long enough to complete their initial IEP, solution needed! CFT or IEP facilitator can play a vital role in creating a safe meeting environment | workgroup to discuss the CFT/IEP process collaboration and report out to the Sub-workgroup on November 30, 2016 meeting. - Draft a statewide document to inform practice (to be discussed during the small workgroup) - Draft documents |

| AGENDA ITEM | NOTES/DISCUSSION | ACTION ITEMS |
|--|--|---|
| V. Placement Information and Resources for Education Veronica Coates | Articulate guidelines that would be helpful for Education, Probation, Child Welfare-outlining the required role of the different agencies Who from Education should participate in a CFT? How and when do they participate? What are the CFT and IEP's methodology and decision making process? When might IEP invite a member or members of a CFT to participate? When should there be coordination between SELPA, Probation, Child Welfare (before or after placement?) There is a Foster Child Education Unit at CDE Parents place their children in residential setting outside the IEP CW wants to capitalizes on Educations more flexible placement options Demonstration of resources available on CDE web-site | when education can be invited to a CFT (to be discussed during the small workgroup) |
| VI. Next Meeting Stuart Oppenheim, CFPIC & Ahmed Nemr, CDSS | CFT/IEP document (matrix) with the following suggested information: Type of meeting, who must be there, who should be there, what is the purpose, what statute is it in Reach out to probation Reach out to CCL regarding GH Placement that are not STRTP CDE report out from the Dept. of Finance Next meeting: November 30, 9:00-12:30, CDSS-Room 1804 | - Invite CCL and Probation to the next meeting. |